

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 have been amended. New claim 22 has been added. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants believe the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampath et al. (US 6,266,774) in view of Kamath et al. (US 6,754,696). The Examiner states that Sampath discloses the claimed invention except for the feature of a server including a storage device that is managed by the client. The Examiner cites Kamath et al. for supplying the missing teaching.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 are patentable over Sampath et al. and Kamath et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest updating the security information stored in the storage device that the client manages in the server without communication between the client and the server.

In the present application, security information to which a client refers is stored in a storage apparatus on the server side, and the security information is updated without a request from the client. That is, communication between the client and the server is not needed in order to update the security information. Hence, even in the state where the client has not been started, the security information can be updated. After the client is started, access control can be performed based on the latest security information. See, e.g., page 9, line 14 to page 10, line 18.

In contrast, communication between the client and the server is required to update an anti-virus program in Sampath et al., which discloses a method of updating software (an anti-virus program) of a client. According to this method, in response to a request from the client, a Web page is created on the server side and client authentication is performed. After the authentication is complete, a program (ActiveX) that checks software on the client side is sent from the server to the client, and it is checked whether the software of the client is latest. If not latest, latest software is downloaded from the server to the client or software upgrading is performed. See, e.g., column 6, line 44 to column 7, line 43.

Kamath et al. disclose a file system (called Extended File System) which enables access to files stored in a remote storage like access to a local file stored in the storage of a client, but it does not cure the deficiencies of Sampath et al., in that it also fails to teach or suggest updating the security information stored in the storage device that the client manages in the server without communication between the client and the server.

As discussed above, an anti-virus program is downloaded or upgraded in response to a request from the client in Sampath et al. Thus, in order to update an anti-virus program, the client having been started, communication between the client and the server need be performed. In Kamath et al., a remote file is updated as a corresponding local file is updated. That is, if the local file is updated, the file is sent to the remote and the remote file is updated to the file. Thus, when the remote file is updated, communication between the client and the server occurs. Kamath et al. does not suggest omitting communication between the client and the server in Sampath et al.

Accordingly, even if combined, Sampath et al. and Kamath et al. do not disclose or suggest updating security information without communication between the client and the server. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21, and claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-20 depending therefrom, are patentable over Sampath et al. and Kamath et al.

Applicants respectfully assert that new claim 22 is patentable over the cited references because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest updating, in a server, security information stored in a storage device to security information received by the server, and referencing the security information stored in the storage device of the server, in the client, each time the client accesses a file stored in the storage device of the server.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No.: 10/656,507
Amdt. dated: September 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 7, 2005

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Chun-Pok Leung
Reg. No. 41,405

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300

RL:rl
60595937 v1